## Exhibit D

```
L512SECc
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      SECURITIES and EXCHANGE
      COMMISSION,
 4
                      Plaintiff,
5
                 v.
                                                20 Civ. 10832 (AT)(SN)
6
      RIPPLE LABS, INC., et al.,
 7
                      Defendants.
 8
9
                                                New York, N.Y.
                                                May 21, 2021
10
                                                2:00 p.m.
11
      Before:
12
                             HON. SARAH NETBURN,
                                                U.S. Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
                                 APPEARANCES
16
      SECURITIES and EXCHANGE COMMISSION
17
           Attorneys for Plaintiff SEC
      BY: JORGE G. TENREIRO
           DUGAN BLISS
18
           DAPHNA A. WAXMAN
19
           JON A. DANIELS
           ROBERT MOYE
20
           BENJAMIN HANAUER
           LADAN F. STEWART
21
           MARK R. SYLVESTER
22
      DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON, LLP
23
           Attorneys for Defendant Ripple Labs, Inc.
24
      BY: ANDREW J. CERESNEY
           MARY JO WHITE
25
           LISA ZORNBERG
```

L51sSEC2

explicit statutory good faith defenses. That is clearly under <a href="Bilzerian">Bilzerian</a>. Our defense is not a good faith defense, and it is certainly not the defense where there is a statute that explicitly says you have to -- explicitly, excuse me, says that you have to show good faith, which is what you were dealing with in this case.

THE COURT: At this point, can you address -- I think it is related to what you're talking about now -- the argument that the SEC raised that your individual defendants -- who I know are not your clients -- are raising a good faith defense, and that in your applications and letter briefing to Judge Torres, you have suggested that the evidence will be the same for both of those defenses?

MR. RAPAWY: So I think that the argument there, your Honor, is that some of the same evidence is relevant, not that the -- and I will clarify a little bit further. I can't say whether the defendants, if and when they answer, will raise an affirmative good faith defense. That's not my decision to make, and it may never come to pass.

I can say that to the extent that the defendants are saying that the SEC hasn't met its burden to show that they acted recklessly or with knowledge that they were violating the law or aided and abetted with that knowledge. To the extent they are making that argument, that is not a good faith defense. That is, instead, a claim that — it is a mere denial